

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
 APPELLATE SIDE
CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 618 OF 2007
 THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA ... APPLICANT.
 VS.
 GLEN ISSAC PETER @ MICHAEL ... RESPONDENT.
 MRS. SHINDE APP FOR THE APPLICANT-STATE.
 RESPONDENT PRESENT IN PERSON.
CORAM : SRI R.M.S.KHANDEPARKAR
AND SRI A.A.SAYED, JJ.
DATE : DECEMBER 12, 2007.
 P.C.

1. Heard the learned APP for the applicant- State
 and the respondent who is present in person.

2. This is an application for condonation eleven
 days delay in filing the appeal against the impugned
 order of granting bail, passed by the Special judge
 under M.C.O.C. Act in Special Case No. 4 of 2006.

3. The Respondent who is present in person prays
 for adjournment on the ground that he wants to engage
 advocate, however, considering the matter in issue, we
 do not find it worth to adjourn the matter. Suffice it
 to observe that considering the facts and circumstances
 of the case, sufficient case is made out to condone the
 delay of eleven days in filing the appeal against the

impugned order. The delay is therefore condoned and the application stands disposed of accordingly.

[R.M.S.KHANDEPARKAR,J]

[A.A.SAYED, J.]

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

APPELLATE SIDE

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 504 OF 2007

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA ... APPLICANT.

VS.

GLEN ISSAC PETER @ MICHAEL ... RESPONDENT.

MRS. SHINDE APP FOR THE APPLICANT-STATE.

RESPONDENT PRESENT IN PERSON.

CORAM : SRI R.M.S.KHANDEPARKAR

AND SRI A.A.SAYED, JJ.

DATE : DECEMBER 12, 2007.

P.C.

1. Heard the learned APP for the appellant- State and the respondent, who is present in person prays for time to adjourn the matter. We find no reason to adjourn the matter.

2. The appellant herein challenges the impugned order of grant of bail to the respondent. The Trial Judge, after considering the materials on record and particularly, the confessional statement on which reliance was sought to be placed before the Trial Court in support of the contention that no bail should be granted to the respondent, granted bail to the respondent. We find that the Trial Court on proper

analysis of all the materials arrived at a correct finding for grant of bail to the applicant (the respondent herein) and in that view of the matter, no interference is called for in the impugned order.

Hence, the appeal stands rejected.

.....

[R.M.S.KHANDEPAKAR, J.]

[A.A.SAYED, J.]